

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

Friedrich Lu, Plaintiff
v
Boston College, Defendant

Civil Case No

COMPLAINT

1) The Federal Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this case under 42 USC §1983.

2) Both parties are residents of eastern ^{division} ~~district~~, District of Massachusetts.

3) On or about February 19, 2009, Boston College through its campus police, which it failed to train, violated my rights secured by the Fourth Amendment to the United States Constitution (unreasonable search and seizure clause).

4) Lu requests all remedies available to me

5) Lu demands jury trial.

Plaintiff: Friedrich Lu, pro se

Date: February 17, 2012

Phone: None

Email: X2flu@yahoo.com

Address: 444 Harrison Avenue, Boston, MA 02118

FILED
IN CLERKS OFFICE
2012 FEB 17 A 11:18
U.S. DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MASS.

To: Chief Judge Mark L Wolff, United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts
From: Friedrich Lu, pro se
Date: February 17, 2012
Phone: None
Email: kellu@yahoo.com
Address: 444 Harrison Avenue, Boston, MA 02118

Re: Friedrich Lu v Harvard School of Dental Medicine, 00-CV-11492-MLW

(1) In the document #49 (dated 03/29/2002, "Judge Mark L Wolff, Memorandum and Order") of the above case, the last page seemed to direct me to seek prior approval from you if and when I ~~file~~^{submit} a ~~civil~~ case against defendants of that case.

(2) On or about 09/23/02, I initiated a case Friedrich Lu v Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 02-CV-11860-RCL, none of whose defendants overlapped with those in the Harvard case. Nonetheless, MIT defendants filed a motion to dismiss (Document #11, 12/11/2002, Motion of MIT to dismiss for failure to comply with the court's order), asserting the Harvard order covered/benefitted them and everybody else in the world. Over my strenuous objections (Document #18, 12/24/2002) - in part no such order to cover them (MIT defendants), and in part your order being unconstitutionally vague if applied to cover them and all others of the world - the late district judge Reginald C Lindsay granted their motion to dismiss, unless I should pay a fine of five hundred dollars (\$500) to the United States coffer, which I did (Document #24, 01/28/2003). Still Judge Lindsay soon found another pretext to dismiss. United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit summarily affirmed the judgment of district court, including the \$500 forfeiture due to my violation of your order in the Harvard case.

(3) The outcome of both cases (Harvard and MIT) would be, if they had not been mine, laughable thanks to the Alice-in-the-Wonderland nature.

(4) Today I intend to file a new case, who defendant has nothing to do with there is the Harvard case. For fear of running afoul of your order (what a pity when the world is like this), I present it to you, for nothing else (merit of the case, my financial status, etc) but you preview whether the new case is subject to your decade-old order. It is up to you whether to make a ruling in this aspect - and this aspect only (unless the new case is randomly assigned to you). If you can just excuse why I should not lawfully prosecute the case without your prior blessing, let you speak now or forever hold your peace.